Page 1 of 2
United States District Court
Southern District of Texas

## **ENTERED**

February 27, 2025
Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS CORPUS CHRISTI DIVISION

DWAYNE RIVENS-BAKER, JR.,	§	
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
V.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:23-CV-00334
	§	
BRYAN COLLIER, et al.,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	

## ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM & RECOMMENDATION

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Julie Hampton's Memorandum and Recommendation ("M&R"). (D.E. 34). The M&R recommends that the Court grant in part and deny in part Defendants' motion to dismiss. *Id.* at 1.

The parties were provided proper notice of, and the opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge's M&R. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b); General Order No. 2002-13. No objection has been filed. When no timely objection has been filed, the district court need only determine whether the Magistrate Judge's M&R is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (per curiam); *Powell v. Litton Loan Servicing, L.P.*, No. 4:14-CV-02700, 2015 WL 3823141, at \*1 (S.D. Tex. June 18, 2015) (Harmon, J.) (citation omitted).

Having reviewed the proposed findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge, the filings of the parties, the record, and the applicable law, and finding that the M&R is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law, the Court **ADOPTS** the M&R in its entirety. (D.E. 34). The Court **GRANTS** in part and **DENIES** in part Defendants' motion to dismiss. (D.E. 20). Accordingly, the Court:

- **DISMISSES** with prejudice Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim against Sgt. Salinas in his individual capacity for monetary damages;
- **DISMISSES** with prejudice Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment excessive force claims against Assistant Warden Samaniego and Executive Director Collier in their supervisory and individual capacities for allegedly putting into place allegedly unconstitutional use-of-force polices;
- **DISMISSES without prejudice** Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment claim—related to TDCJ policies allegedly encouraging excessive and unnecessary use of force against Executive Director Collier in his official capacity for injunctive relief;
- **DENIES** Defendants' motion with respect to Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment excessive force claims against Sgt. Salinas and Sgt. Anciso in their individual capacities for monetary damages; and
- **DENIES** Defendants' motion with respect to Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment deliberate indifference claim against Assistant Warden Samaniego in his individual capacity for monetary damages.

SO ORDERED.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Signed: Corpus Christi, Texas February 76, 2025